

REMARKS

Claims 13, 15, 17, and 20-29 are pending in this application. Claims 13, 15, and 22-25 are independent claims. Claims 17, 20, 21, and 26-29 are dependent claims. Claims 1-12, 14, 16, 18, and 19 have been cancelled.

Claims 15, 17, 20, and 25-27 have been allowed. Claims 13, 21-24, and 29 have been rejected. Amendments to claims 13 and 22-24 are presented herein. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In numbered paragraphs 2 and 3 on pages 2-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 13, 21-24, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Biggs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,410,669). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons presented below.

Independent claim 13 recites, as amended, "assigning a second address space of the memory map, which is separate from the first address space of the main memory **and is fixed**, for the cache memory **only** when the cache memory is acting as the random access memory" (emphasis added). Independent claims 22-24 recite similar language.

The Briggs reference discloses that each memory block may be located anywhere within a 4-Gbyte address range of the memory map (Briggs at col. 2, lines 42-44).

In contrast, in the present invention, a second address space of a memory map, which is separate from a first address space of the main memory and is fixed, is assigned from the cache memory only when the cache memory is acting as the random access memory. See the specification at page 58, lines 5-24, and FIG. 36. In other words, in the present invention, the address range when the cache is used as RAM is fixed in the address map. Thus, the address range is fixed when the cache is used as RAM, and not dynamically changed as disclosed in Briggs.

Therefore, it is submitted that independent claims 13 and 22-24 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Dependent claims 21, 28, and 29 respectively depend from the above-discussed independent claims 13 and 23 and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 13, 21-24, 28, and 29 patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under § 102.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding rejections, the application is submitted to be in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Finally, if there are any additional fees associated with filing of this response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4/12/04

By: C. Joan Gilsdorf
Christine Joan Gilsdorf
Registration No. 43,635

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501